

event, the above amendment to claim 1 regarding group Z renders moot the improper Markush group rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

As correctly noted by the examiner, Boettcher et al. (U.S. '925) cannot be eliminated as a reference by perfection of the claim of benefit to foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119. Counsel apologizes for the confusion. The rejection in view of U.S. '925 in combination with U.S. '948 was traversed in the Amendment of June 28, 1995.

In any event, the above amendment renders moot the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. See also the examiner's discussion of what is not suggested by the combined prior art disclosures at page 4, lines 3-6, of the October 25, 1995, Office Action.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

**Obviousness-Type Double-Patenting Rejection
in view of Perregaard (U.S. '925)**

For the reasons discussed above with regard to the §103 rejection, the rejection of obviousness-type double patenting in view of U.S. '925 is rendered moot by the above amendment to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian P. Heaney (Reg. No. 32,542)
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza I
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400
Arlington, Virginia 22201
(703) 812-5308

Filed: January 24, 1996

BPH:kdp123:merck617.am2